

THE *Dan Smoot Report*



DAN SMOOT

Vol. 15, No. 50 (Broadcast 747) December 15, 1969 Dallas, Texas

AGNEW AND THE NETWORKS: In a speech at Des Moines on November 13, 1969, Vice President Spiro Agnew criticized TV networks' management of the news. Mr. Agnew had one specific complaint, one general.

His specific complaint was that after President Nixon had delivered a carefully prepared 32-minute TV speech on Vietnam, network commentators immediately followed with commentaries on the speech, most of them expressing hostility to what the President said.

I share Mr. Agnew's irritation about network experts telling the people what they have just seen and heard — as if the people were idiots who must have a speech explained to them. But I do not think the networks are thus abusing the President. The President has all the free, prime time he wants, usually on all networks, to say whatever he pleases. The TV networks have never denied a President ample opportunity to reach the people with his ideas, opinions, and recommendations.

Bill Moyers (formerly, President Johnson's press secretary; now, publisher of *Newsday*) said "To give a president . . . 30 minutes of uninterrupted and unanswered access to 60 million Americans, is too great a power to give one man, no matter how honest his motives." That could be.

Moyers said that network commentators following a presidential television speech with analyses "provide a good balance."⁽¹⁾ That could be and ought to be, but never has been.

Generally, the network commentators support the President's positions. No TV network ever tried to balance a presidential proposal by presenting the viewpoint of constitutional conservatives. No TV network commentator has ever mentioned that most of the domestic programs of every President, since TV network newscasting began, were clear violations of the Constitution and that their net effect on the American nation was harmful.

From Eisenhower to Nixon, the only serious disagreement between the elite of TV network news-

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT is published weekly by The Dan Smoot Report, Inc., Box 9538, Dallas, Texas 75214 (office at 6441 Gaston Ave.). Subscriptions: \$18.00 for 2 years; \$10.00, 1 year; \$6.00, 6 months. Dan Smoot was born in Missouri, reared in Texas. With BA and MA degrees from SMU (1938 and 1940), he joined the Harvard faculty (1941) as a Teaching Fellow, doing graduate work in American civilization. From 1942 to 1951, he was an FBI agent; from 1951 to 1955, a commentator on national radio and television. In 1955, he started his present independent, free-enterprise business: publishing this REPORT and abbreviating it each week for radio and TV broadcasts available for commercial sponsorship by business firms.

Copyright by Dan Smoot, 1969. Second Class mail privilege authorized at Dallas, Texas.

casters and the President in office has been about the Vietnam war. Most network commentators seem to favor the immediate American surrender advocated by pro-communist demonstrators; hence, they are critical of Nixon's plan for a slow surrender. But the networks do not present the viewpoint held, probably, by most Americans: namely, that the only safe way for us to get out of the Vietnam war, or any other war, is to win it.

* * * * *

THE REAL CENSORSHIP: Vice President Agnew's general complaint concerning TV network newscasting was that a dozen men, answerable to no one except themselves and their corporate employers, enjoy a government-granted monopoly on the news that some 40 million Americans hear — culling and distorting the news to give the public a picture, often quite false, that the TV broadcasters want the public to have.

It is possible that, in saying such things, Agnew is playing an assigned role — working the other side of the street for Richard Nixon, to revive hope in those forever hopeful people who, for 16 years, have been saying, "but deep inside, the *real* Nixon is a conservative."

Nonetheless, Agnew spoke the obvious truth; and all the networks did all they could to deny the obvious.

Julian Goodman, president of NBC, said:

"Any fairminded viewer knows that the television networks . . . present all significant views on issues of importance."⁽²⁾

That is not so. None of the networks will permit use of their facilities for presentation of the viewpoint of constitutional conservatives. All three TV networks and all four major radio networks have refused, more than once, to sell time to reputable business firms wanting to sponsor my once-a-week news analysis. Most of them just peremptorily refused. Those that bothered to give a reason said quite bluntly that the networks present only the news prepared and controlled by their own staffs.

Most TV stations exercise the same kind of

total censorship of constitutional conservatism.⁽³⁾

I, unable to get on networks, was compelled to resort to the clumsy and expensive method of syndication to distribute my weekly TV broadcasts (filming them and shipping them by mail).

Despite the resistance of most stations (utter refusal of many), I managed to get my broadcast on some 53 TV stations; and, for a brief time, had an estimated listening audience of about 16 million a week.

In December, 1961, Walter and Victor Reuther suggested to Robert F. Kennedy (then U. S. Attorney General) that the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) do something to get people like me off the air. Nineteen months later, the FCC reminded all networks and stations of its "fairness doctrine." Shortly thereafter, the harassment began.⁽³⁾

The NAACP, SNCC, CORE, the Democrat National Committee, the AFL-CIO's COPE, and any other similar outfit could (and did) bombard stations carrying my commercially-sponsored broadcasts with demands for free and equal time to answer me. Many stations honored these demands — and then got rid of my program as quickly as possible. Some stations obviously used the situation as a pretext for getting me off the air. But most seemed sincerely to feel that they had no choice. The harassment was unpleasant, and they could not afford to give time to answer my sponsored broadcasts. Yet, they feared that if they did not give the free time, the FCC might take action against them.

Thus, by the end of 1967, I was squeezed off television.

The FCC fairness doctrine cuts only one way, however. When constitutional conservatives demand free and equal time to answer the biased analyses and prejudicial remarks of liberal newscasters, they are ignored or contemptuously dismissed.⁽³⁾

* * * * *

FEDERAL RESERVE: Mobley M. Milam served as chief assistant United States Attorney

in San Diego, California, for three years. He resigned on October 18, 1969.

On October 27, Mr. Milam went to a bank in Los Angeles and presented a \$50 Federal Reserve note bearing the notation:

"This note is legal tender for all debts, public and private, and is redeemable in lawful money at the United States Treasury, or at any Federal Reserve Bank."

Mr. Milam asked the bank to redeem his \$50 note. The bank offered him another Federal Reserve note. Mr. Milam said that was like redeeming green stamps with green stamps. He demanded that his Federal Reserve note be redeemed, as stipulated on the face of it, in *lawful money*. He defined *lawful money* as silver, gold, or Lincoln greenbacks (National Bank notes issued by the federal government during the Civil War, approximately \$37 million of which are still outstanding).⁽⁴⁾

"Throughout our history," Milam said, "a dollar has been defined by statute as so many grains of silver or gold, and nothing else. The only other thing defined by statute as 'lawful money' is United States notes, or greenbacks."⁽⁴⁾

But the bank refused to redeem the Federal Reserve note with anything except another one.

On October 31, 1969, Mobley Milam filed suit in federal court at San Diego, against the United States government, the Federal Reserve System, and the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco. He asked for judgement of \$50, in lawful money, plus interest (in lawful money).

Mr. Milam points out that the Federal Reserve System, privately owned, creates paper money (at no cost to itself), then collects huge amounts of interest by lending this fiat money to the U. S. government. He says the private owners of the Federal Reserve are thus, "not only getting rich at our expense but also creating the huge public debt which is the basic cause of the inflation which is tearing this country apart."⁽⁴⁾

Claiming that his suit, challenging the legality of Federal Reserve notes, was brought on behalf

of all the people of the United States, Mobley Milam says:

"This suit goes to the very foundation of our government and society. It strikes at the root cause of inflation, public debt, and loss of our freedom to big government.

"Americans won't be able to maintain freedom, control inflation, or government unless we revitalize our right to redeem paper currency in gold or silver.

"Like Russia, the United States is one of the few governments of the great commercial nations that tries to prevent gold ownership (and silver may be next). Simultaneously, the Treasury attempts to downgrade gold as a useless, barbaric relic. . . .

"If gold is so useless and unimportant, then why is it necessary to make it illegal to own? The bureaucrats dislike gold, because when we own it, they cannot control us. When paper currency is backed by gold or silver, and must be redeemed on demand, the people can force a government to stop spending our money by simply going to any bank, demanding redemption, and thereby reducing government's money supply. . . . With a fully redeemable currency, the people control their government. With fiat money, the bureaucrats control us."⁽⁵⁾

* * * * *

GOD AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: Steven Minyen, an 18-year-old student at Washington High School in Fremont, California, has attended Assembly of God Sunday Schools and church services all of his life. He is a very devout boy. He has deep faith that God, Creator of the universe and all things in it, helps people who turn to Him in supplication. He prays and reads his Bible, and, when others show interest, tries to explain to them the meaning and beauty of God in his life.

One day this fall (October 28, 1969, to be exact), Steven was discussing God with a few schoolmates. It was during the lunch hour. The youngsters had eaten, and were out on the lawn

waiting for afternoon classes to begin. Steven was not haranguing a crowd or making a nuisance of himself. He was just having a quiet talk with some other students who were interested in hearing his ideas about the meaning of God.

A teacher came by and listened long enough to verify a suspicion: this boy was talking about God, on the grounds of a *public school*, to other students.

The teacher took Steven to the office of the principal, Dr. Robert Callahan. Dr. Callahan was disturbed. The California state educational code prohibits the teaching or instruction of any sectarian or denominational religious doctrine, directly or indirectly, on any campus of a public school.

"Steve," the principal said, "will you stop these discussions or do I have to suspend you?"⁽⁶⁾

Steven could not promise not to discuss God; so, the principal suspended the boy from school. It was not a real suspension, a *formal* suspension, school officials later explained. The principal merely sent the boy home and told him he could not come back until his parents came with him and gave their guarantee that he would never again talk about God at school.

That was Tuesday noon. Steven went home and reported immediately; but it was late Wednesday afternoon before his parents could get an appointment for a conference with the principal about getting him back in school.

At the conference, the principal said Steven could return to school the next day; but he put the boy under a temporary restraining order, until further notice, against saying anything whatever about God while at school.

It was not a real, a *formal* restraining order — just a statement by the principal that Steven would be disciplined if he talked about God again.

The principal laid down guidelines about it too. He told Steven that even if the subject of God came up in Steven's presence, though initiated by someone else, Steven would be held responsible and disciplined for it, because of Steven's record of pro-God activism.

Steven returned to high school after a day-and-a-half suspension (which was not *really* a suspension), under the principal's restraining order (which was not *really* a restraining order). The parents consulted the district attorney, and, one week after Steven's reinstatement in school, got a formal decision from the highest school-governing body in the county: Steven's talking about God to other kids was not "teaching" or "instruction" within the meaning of California law — and was not, therefore, unlawful.

I talked to Steven's father, Mr. Asa J. Minyen, 4530 Santa Cruz Court, Fremont, California. He said:

"Narcotics and pornography in the public schools don't seem to bother them very much; but if you bring in God, you cause trouble."

* * * * *

FOOTNOTES

- (1) *Dallas Morning News*, Nov. 26, 1969, D3; *Dallas Times Herald*, Nov. 26, 1969, A10
- (2) *Dallas Morning News*, Nov. 14, 1969, A16
- (3) Detailed, documented accounts of station and network censorship of constitutional conservatism, and of the use of the FCC fairness doctrine to force such news commentaries off the air are given in the *The Dan Smoot Report*, Sept. 16, 1963; Apr. 6, 1964; June 29, 1964; Sept. 21, 1964; July 24, 1967.
- (4) *San Diego Union*, Nov. 1, 1969
- (5) *International Harry Schultz Letter*, Nov. 13, 1969
- (6) *Oakland, California, Tribune*, Oct. 30, 1969

Subscribe Today to The Dan Smoot Report

6 mos. \$6.00 — 1 YR. \$10.00 — 2 yrs. \$18.00

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT

BOX 9538, DALLAS, TEXAS 75214

Telephone: TAYlor 1-2303

Send reprints to your friends and suggest they order reprints too.

REPRINTS OF THIS ISSUE (for bulk mailing to one address):

1 copy	\$.25	100 copies	\$ 6.50
10 copies	1.00	200 copies	12.00
25 copies	2.00	500 copies	28.00
50 copies	3.50	1000 copies	50.00

Texans Add 4% for Sales Tax

(Add 50c for special-handling postage)